

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**FEB 06 2006**

Dear USPTO Worker,

**Re:** USSN 10/036,591, Flam, "Graphical user interface for automated process control", filed 11/7/01,  
attorney docket sparta01.005

Attached please find a response to the Office action of 11/8/2005 in the above patent application. Please forward the response to Examiner Robert M. Stevens, GAU 2176.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon E. Nelson, #30,983,  
Attorney of record

If you have received this communication by mistake,  
please destroy it and notify [genelson@comcast.net](mailto:genelson@comcast.net)

FEB 06 2006

sparta01.005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
(sparta01.005)

**Applicant:** Flam **Paper No.:** N/A  
**Application No:** 10/036,591 **Group Art Unit:** 2176  
**Filed:** 11/7/01 **Examiner:** Robert M. Stevens  
Fax: 571-273-8300

**Title:** *Graphical User Interface for Automated Process Control*

.....  
Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Response under 37 C.F.R. 1.111 to a first Office action in an RCE**

**Status of the prosecution**

Applicant received a final Office action on 6/2/05 in the above patent application in which all claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over the combination of Texier and Schultz. Applicant's attorney responded by arranging an interview which was held July 7, 2005 to discuss the claims and the references and then filing a traversal of the rejection on that same date. Examiner replied with an Advisory Action in which he maintained the rejection. Applicant thereupon filed a Request for Continuing Examination including a Submission in which claim 1 was amended to better distinguish it from the references. Applicant received a first Office action in the RCE on 11/8/2005 in which Examiner stated

... Applicant's amendments to the claims significantly change the scope of the claimed invention as a whole. As such, Applicant's arguments concerning the previous rejections of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been rendered moot. (Office action of 11/8/2005, §5)

and then rejected the amended claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as obvious over two new references, U.S. Patent 5,586,039, Hirsch, et al., *Computer-aided manufacturing support method and system for specifying relationships and dependencies between process type components*, issued Dec. 17, 1996 (hereinafter "Hirsch") and U.S. patent 6,201,996,